


ALCOHOL IN "PATENT MEDICINES."

The following percentages of alcohol in the "patent medicines" named are given by the Massachusetts State Board Analyst in the published document No. 34:

	Per cent. of alcohol (by volume)
Lydia Pinkham's Vegetable Compound.....	20.6
Paine's Celery Compound	21
Dr. Williams's Vegetable Jaundice Bitters	18.5
Whiskol, "a non-intoxicating stimulant".....	28.2
Colden's Liquid Beef Tonic, "recommended for treatment of alcohol habit,"	26.5
Ayer's Sarsaparilla	26.2
Thayer's Compound Extract of Sarsaparilla....	21.5
Hood's Sarsaparilla	18.8
Allen's Sarsaparilla	13.5
Dana's Sarsaparilla	13.5
Brown's Sarsaparilla	13.5
Peruna	28.5
Vinol, Wine of Cod-Liver Oil	18.8
Dr. Peters's Kuriko	14
Carter's Physical Extract	22
Hocker's Wigwam Tonic	20.7
Hoofland's German Tonic	29.3
Hove's Arabian Tonic, "not a rum drink"	13.2
Jackson's Golden Seal Tonic	19.6
Mensman's Peptonized Beef Tonic	16.5
Parker's Tonic, "purely vegetable"	41.6
Schneck's Seaweed Tonic "entirely harmless" ..	19.5
Exater's Mandrake Bitters	16.3
Boker's Stomach Bitters	42.6
Burdock Blood Bitters	25.2
Greene's Nervura	17.2
Hartshorn's Bitters	22.2
Hoofland's German Bitters, "entirely vegetable" ..	25.6
Hop Bitters	12
Hcstetter's Stomach Bitters	44.3
Kaufman's Sulphur Bitters, "contains no alcohol" (as a matter of fact it contains 20.5 per cent of alcohol, and no sulphur)	20.5
Puritana	22
Richardson's Concentrated Sherry Wine Bitters ..	47.5
Warner's Safe Tonic Bitters	35.7
Warren's Bilious Bitters	21.5
Faith Whitcomb's Nerve Bitters	20.3

In connection with this list, think of beer, which contains only from two to five per cent of alcohol, while some of these "bitters" contain ten times as much, making them stronger than whisky, far stronger than sherry or port, with claret and champagne way behind.

 Duplicates of this list may be obtained upon application to the Publication Office of the Medical Society of the State of California, Room 1, Y. M. C. A. Building, San Francisco.

Congratulatory to Missouri.

From the October number of the *Journal Missouri State Medical Association* we take the following extract, and beg to congratulate the Council upon its decision and wish it strength to carry it out. That its advertising pages have been adorned with some things that should not be there, is beyond doubt; that they will shortly disappear, now seems probable.

"At a recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the Judicial Council, the members were disposed to criticise harshly some advertisements of proprietary remedies carried by the *Journal*, and decided to discontinue all those where the formula was not known or where claims not founded on fact were made. The correctness of the decision of the committee is beyond question. While it may be considered within the province of a medical journal to bring to the attention of its readers, through its advertising columns such preparations as are meritorious, no article should be advertised unless the chemical formula be given, or in the case of a pharmaceutical compound unless the name and proportion of each active ingredient appear. That many adver-

tisements may be lost is quite probable, but the time has arrived when a firm stand should be taken, not only by the *Journal of the American Medical Association* and State journals, but by all reputable medical journals."

We heartily commend this to the careful attention of the officers of the State medical organizations of Michigan, New York, Illinois, Nebraska, Maryland, Wisconsin, Oklahoma, and Kansas.

Objectionable Advertising.

C. S. N. Hallberg, Chicago, H. W. Wiley, Washington, D. C., and H. C. Wood, Jr., Philadelphia, give accounts of cases illustrating fraudulent claims of patent medicines, complexion powders, etc., and notice certain rulings of the Postoffice Department and of the law officers of the government. For a time the Postoffice Department prohibited the sending of poisons through the mail. Influence has been brought to bear, however, and the ruling was changed so that it is possible to send any poison through the mail, provided it carries the label or superscription of the manufacturer or dealer. The authors call the attention of the department to the fact that in almost every state poisonous remedies must be marked with poison labels indicating their dangerous character, and it would be well for the Postoffice Department to follow their example. The ruling of the Department of Justice in regard to the withdrawal of mail privileges is rather loose, and many fraudulent medical concerns are working under it with impunity. The difficulty of obtaining legislation to mend the matter is chiefly in the fact that many of the senators and representatives are themselves the dupes of these concerns, believing that they really have some virtue.—*Journal A. M. A.*, September 16th.

Well-Deserved Honor.

Dr. T. D. Crothers of Hartford, Conn., superintendent of the Walnut Lodge Hospital, has accepted an invitation to deliver the first oration in the Norman Keer memorial lectureship, at London, England, October 10, 1905. Dr. Keer will be remembered as an eminent London physician who made a special study of inebriety, alcoholism and other drug disorders. He wrote several excellent books on this subject, and was instrumental in securing the enactment of laws for the control of inebriates, and the promotion of hospitals for their care throughout Great Britain. He founded the British Society for the Study of Inebriety, in 1884, and this society and his friends have organized a memorial lectureship for yearly orations on his life and work. It is a very pleasant recognition of the progress of medical science in this country that an American physician should be invited to deliver the first lecture.

Secret Remedies.

Practically the entire controversy really rages about the remedy of unknown composition, and all attempts to prove inconsistency cannot disprove the propositions that the man who prescribes a remedy of composition unknown to him endangers his patient by subjecting him to (1) the possible administration of some component drug perilous to him in his present condition, and one which the physician would not administer, if he were aware of it, in that particular case; (2) the administration of some component drug in a quantity that a proper knowledge of the facts would preclude in the case in point; (3) the possibility of a dosing with something to which idiosyncrasy renders him especially susceptible, with the danger that not knowing the cause of the consequent serious symptoms the physician may commit the fatal error of judgment, of pushing the remedy instead of discontinuing it, and finally (4) the possible administration of a drug which, viewed even as a "clinical entity," may not be the same to-day as it was a little time ago. Such cases of materially "amended formulæ" have happened.—*St. Louis Medical Review*.